arXiv:1108.1075v1 [math.LO] 4 Aug 2011

EXPONENTIAL FIELDS AND ATYPICAL INTERSECTIONS

JONATHAN KIRBY AND BORIS ZILBER

Abstract. We give an axiomatization of a class of exponential fields including the pseudo-exponential fields previously introduced by the second author, which is tame (superstable) over its interpretation of arithmetic. This class is exactly the elementary class of pseudo-exponential fields if and only if the diophantine conjecture CIT on atypical intersections of tori with subvarieties is true.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
Outline of the paper 3
2. Strong kernels 4
2.1. Failure of the Schanuel property 4
2.2. Strong kernel 4
2.3. Atypical intersections 4
2.4. Generic fibres 5
2.5. Axiomatizing strong kernel 5
2.6. Consequence of the failure of CIT 6
3. Some algebra of exponential fields 7
3.1. Partial E-fields and kernels 7
3.2. Kernel extensions 8
3.3. The free ELA-extension 9
3.4. Strong kernel-preserving extensions 11
3.5. Semistrong extensions 11
3.6. Free ELA-fields and semi-strong extensions 12
4. The class $\mathbf{ECF}_{\mathbf{StrK}}$ 14
4.1. Axioms 14
4.2. Saturation over the kernel 14
4.3. Uniqueness and homogeneity 15
4.4. Superstability over the kernel 17
5. Complete elementary theory 17
5.1. First-order axioms 17
5.2. Exponential algebraicity and exponential transcendence 18

Date: version 1.0, August 5, 2011.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03C65, 11G35.

Key words and phrases. Exponential fields, anomalous intersections, Schanuel's conjecture, predimension.

5.3. Infinite exponential transcendence degree 19
5.4. The completeness proof 20
5.5. Exponential-algebraic closedness 21
6. Corollaries of CIT 23
7. Other kernels 24
References 25

1. Introduction

In [Zil05], the second author introducted a class of exponential fields he called *pseudo-exponential fields*, as the class of models $\langle F; +, \cdot, \exp\rangle$ of the following axioms.

1. **ELA-field:** F is an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, and its exponential map exp is a homomorphism from its additive group to its multiplicative group, which is surjective.
2. **Standard kernel:** the kernel of the exponential map is an infinite cyclic group generated by a transcendental element τ.
3. **Schanuel Property:** The *predimension function*

$$\delta(\bar{x}) := \mathrm{td}(\bar{x}, \exp(\bar{x})) - \mathrm{ldim}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{x})$$

   satisfies $\delta(\bar{x}) \geqslant 0$ for all tuples $\bar{x}$ from F.
4. **Strong exponential-algebraic closedness:** If V is a rotund, additively and multiplicatively free subvariety of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{a}}^n \times \mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}^n$ defined over F and of dimension n, and $\bar{a}$ is a finite tuple from F, then there is $\bar{x}$ in F such that $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \in V$ and is generic in V over $\bar{a}$.
5. **Countable Closure Property:** For each finite subset X of F, the exponential algebraic closure $\mathrm{ecl}^F(X)$ of X in F is countable.

Precise definitions of the terms in axioms 4 and 5 are given later, in sections 3.4 and 5.2. Intuitively, axiom 4 says that any system of equations which can have a solution in some model of axioms 1—3 does have a solution, and axiom 5 says that such a system should only have countably many solutions. The axioms are not all first-order, but can all be expressed in the logic $L_{\omega_1,\omega}(Q)$, which allows countable conjunctions of formulas and the quantifier Qx: *there exist uncountably many x such that ....*

We denote by $\mathbf{ECF_{SK}}$ the class of models of axioms 1—4, and call the models *Exponentially-Closed Fields with Standard Kernel.* (Axiom 5 will not play any role.) In [Zil05] the same class was called $\mathcal{EC}^*_{st}$. Theorem 5.13 of that paper states that there is an $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-sentence Ψ such that $F \models \Psi$ iff $F \in \mathbf{ECF_{SK}}$ and F has infinite exponential transcendence degree. Furthermore there is exactly one countable model of Ψ, up to isomorphism, which we call $B_{\aleph_0}$. Thus there is a unique complete first-order theory T such that $\Psi \vdash T$, specifically $T = \mathrm{Th}(B_{\aleph_0})$.

Write $\ker(F) = \{x \in F \mid \exp(x) = 1\}$, the kernel of the exponential map. Define

$$Z(F) = \{r \in F \mid \forall x[x \in \ker \to rx \in \ker]\},$$

the *multiplicative stabilizer* of the kernel. In any ELA-field F with standard kernel, $Z(F)$ will actually be $\mathbb{Z}$, the standard integers, and thus the first-order theory T contains the theory of full arithmetic, and hence is undecidable and unstable. In this paper we show that, if the diophantine conjecture known as CIT (Conjecture on Intersections of Tori with subvarieties) is true, then the effects of arithmetic can be contained within the kernel, and the theory is otherwise tame, in fact *superstable over the kernel* in a certain sense. However, if CIT is false then the effects of arithmetic will be seen in the first-order theory outside the kernel in terms of non-standard integer power functions, and the first-order theory is not so tame.

We study a wider class than $\mathbf{ECF_{SK}}$, the class $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ of Exponentially-Closed Fields with Strong Kernel, given by axioms 1 and 4 above, together with:

2′a: The kernel is a cyclic Z-module.

2′b: Every element of the kernel is transcendental over Z.

2′c Theory of true arithmetic: Z with the restrictions of $+$ and $\cdot$ is a model of the full first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{Z}; +; \cdot \rangle$.

3′. Strong kernel: The predimension function

$$\Delta_F(\bar{x}) = \mathrm{td}(\bar{x}, \exp(\bar{x})/\ker(F)) - \mathrm{ldim}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{x}/\ker(F))$$

satisfies $\Delta_F(\bar{x}) \geqslant 0$ for all tuples $\bar{x}$ from F.

We show that $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ is $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-axiomatizable and, assuming CIT, it is exactly the elementary class $\mathrm{Mod}(T)$. Furthermore, assuming CIT, axiom 4 (strong exponential-algebraic closedness) can be replaced by:

4′ Exponential-algebraic closedness: If V is a rotund subvariety of $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{a}^n \times \mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}^n$ defined over F then there is $\bar{x}$ in F such that $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \in V$.

The main results of the paper including the tameness results are in fact unconditional results about the class $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$.

Outline of the paper. In §2, we explain why the Schanuel property is not first-order expressible, introduce the strong kernel property, and show that it is first-order expressible iff CIT is true. In §3, we develop and explain the algebra of exponential fields which is required subsequently. We introduce the concept of saturation over the kernel within the class $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ in §4, and prove uniqueness of models which are saturated over their ($\aleph_0$-saturated) kernels. A superstability result (over the kernel) for the class $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ follows. In §5 we show that axiom 4 is first-order expressible (assuming the other axioms) and thus the class $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ is elementary assuming CIT. Again under CIT we prove completeness of the first-order theory, and the equivalence of axioms 4 and 4′. In §6 we give some corollaries, and §7 contains some final comments.

2. Strong kernels

2.1. **Failure of the Schanuel property.** It is clear that axioms 1 and 2′ are expressible as first-order axioms schemes. However axiom 3, the Schanuel property, is not. To see this, suppose F satisfies the Schanuel property and $k_1, \ldots, k_n \in \ker(F)$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent. Then $\mathrm{td}(k_1, \ldots, k_n, 1, \ldots, 1) = n$, so $k_1, \ldots, k_n$ are algebraically independent. This is a strong structural property, but it is not true in any elementary extension F of $B_{\aleph_0}$ with non-standard kernel. To see this, suppose $r \in Z(F)$ is transcendental. Then $\{r^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, and it lies in $Z(F)$ since $Z(F)$ is a subring of F. So for any $t \in \ker(F)$, $\{r^n t \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ lies in $\ker(F)$ and is $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, is but of transcendence degree only 2.

2.2. **Strong kernel.** The above failure of the Schanuel property is inside the kernel, and axiom 3′, Strong Kernel, essentially asserts that this is the only place it fails. Given any exponential field F, any subset $X \subseteq F$, and a finite tuple $\bar{a}$ from F, we define the *relative predimension function*

$$\delta(\bar{a}/X) = \mathrm{td}(\bar{a}, \exp(\bar{a})/X, \exp(X)) - \mathrm{ldim}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{a}/X)$$

where by $\mathrm{td}(Y/X)$ we mean the transcendence degree of the field extension $\mathbb{Q}(XY)/\mathbb{Q}(X)$ and by $\mathrm{ldim}_{\mathbb{Q}}(Y/X)$ we mean the dimension of the $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space spanned by $X \cup Y$, quotiented by the subspace spanned by X.

We say that X is *strong* in F, and write $X \lhd F$, iff for every finite tuple $\bar{a}$ from F, $\delta(\bar{a}/X) \geqslant 0$. Thus $\Delta_F(\bar{x}) = \delta(\bar{x}/\ker(F))$, and the Strong Kernel axiom states precisely that the kernel is strongly embedded in F.

2.3. **Atypical intersections.** The diophantine conjecture under which the axiom of strong kernel is first-order concerns atypical intersections of varieties with subgroups.

Let $W \subseteq \mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}^n$ be an irreducible subvariety, defined over $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{alg}}$. Let $H \subseteq \mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}^n$ be an algebraic subgroup.

Let X be a connected component of $W \cap H$. Then X is said to be an *atypical* component of the intersection iff

$$\dim X > \dim W + \dim H - n.$$

(Sometimes X is called an *anomalous* or *unlikely* component of the intersection.)

Let W^{atyp} be the union of all the atypical components of $W \cap H$ for all algebraic subgroups H of $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}^n$.

The Conjecture on Intersections of subvarieties with Tori (CIT) states:

Conjecture. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $W \subseteq \mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}^n$ is any irreducible subvariety then W^{atyp} is a proper Zariski-closed subset of W.*

This statement of the conjecture is in the style of the presentation in section 5 of [BMZ07] and is convenient for us. The conjecture is equivalent to a conjecture of the second author given in [Zil02, Conjecture 1].

A proper algebraic subgroup $H \subseteq \mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}^n$ is given by a list of equations of the form

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} y_i^{m_i} = 1 \tag{$*$}$$

where $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all zero. We may write the equations for H in matrix form as $\bar{y}^M = 1$. We can define the *depth* of H to be the least $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that H is contained in some codimension 1 subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}^n$, which is given by a single equation of the form $(*)$ in which every m_i satisfies $|m_i| \leqslant N$. Then CIT can equivalently be stated as: for every subvariety $W \subseteq \mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}^n$, defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that W^{atyp} is contained in the union of the set of proper algebraic subgroups of $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}^n$ of depth at most N.

Note that W^{atyp} is certainly $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-definable (uniformly in parameters), but if CIT is true then the above shows that W^{atyp} is first-order definable (even uniformly in parameters).

2.4. **Generic fibres.** There is the natural projection map $\mathrm{pr} : G^n \to \mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}^n$. Given $V \subseteq G^n$ irreducible and $b \in \mathrm{pr}(V)$, we consider the fibre $V(b) = \{v \in V \mid \mathrm{pr}(v) = b\}$. Define

$$V^{gf} = \{v \in V \mid \dim V(\mathrm{pr}(v)) = \dim V - \dim \mathrm{pr}(V)\}$$

which is the union of the fibres of generic dimension. If V is reducible, we define V^{gf} to be the union of the W^{gf} as W runs through the irreducible components of V. The fibre dimension theorem (see for example section 2 of [BMZ07] for a clear statement) tells us that V^{gf} is constructible and dense in V, and if V varies in a parametric family then V^{gf} is definable uniformly in the parameters.

2.5. **Axiomatizing strong kernel.** For a subvariety $\mathcal{V} \subseteq G^n \times \mathbb{A}^m$, where $\mathbb{A}$ is affine space, and $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{A}^m$, we write $V_{\bar{p}} \subseteq G^n$ for the fibre of $\mathcal{V}$ at $\bar{p}$, and consider $\mathcal{V} = (V_{\bar{p}})_{\bar{p} \in \mathbb{A}^m}$ as a parametric family of subvarieties of G^n. For such a family, consider the axiom:

$$(\forall \bar{k} \in \ker^m)(\forall \bar{x}) \left[\dim V_{\bar{k}} \geqslant n \vee (\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \notin V_{\bar{k}}^{gf} \vee e^{\bar{x}} \in \mathrm{pr}(V_{\bar{k}})^{atyp}\right]$$

We take the Strong Kernel scheme to be the scheme of all such axioms, for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all families $\mathcal{V}$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. So every subvariety of G^n defined over ker will appear as $V_{\bar{k}}$ for some family $\mathcal{V}$ and some tuple $\bar{k}$ from ker. Clearly (using the fibre dimension theorem again) the Strong Kernel scheme is expressible as an $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-sentence, and, if CIT is true, it is expressible as a first-order axiom scheme.

Proposition. *Let F be a partial E-field. Then F has strong kernel iff it satisfies the Strong Kernel scheme.*

Proof. Suppose the scheme holds, and $\bar{x} \in F^n$ with $\operatorname{td}(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}/\ker(F)) < n$. Let $V = \operatorname{Loc}((\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}})/\ker(F))$. Then $\dim V < n$, so by the scheme, either $e^{\bar{x}} \in \operatorname{pr}(V)^{atyp}$ or $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \notin V^{gf}$. The latter is impossible, since $V \smallsetminus V^{gf}$ is constructible, defined over $\ker(F)$, and not dense in V, but V is the locus of $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}})$ over $\ker(F)$. Hence $e^{\bar{x}} \in \operatorname{pr}(V)^{atyp}$, which means that $e^{\bar{x}}$ lies in a proper algebraic subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}^n$, so F has the strong kernel property.

Conversely, suppose F has the strong kernel property, that $V \subseteq G^n$ is defined over $\ker(F)$ with $\dim V < n$, and that $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \in V^{gf}$. We must show $e^{\bar{x}} \in \operatorname{pr}(V)^{atyp}$. Let H be the smallest algebraic subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}^n$ such that $e^{\bar{x}} \in H$. By strong kernel,

$$\delta(\bar{x}/\ker(F)) = \operatorname{td}(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}/\ker(F)) - \dim H \geqslant 0.$$

Also $\operatorname{td}(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}/\ker(F)) = \operatorname{td}(\bar{x}/e^{\bar{x}}, \ker(F)) + \operatorname{td}(e^{\bar{x}}/\ker(F))$.

Let X be the component of $\operatorname{pr}(V) \cap H$ containing $e^{\bar{x}}$, so we have $\operatorname{td}(e^{\bar{x}}/\ker(F)) \leqslant \dim X$. Also $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \in V^{gf}$, so

$$\operatorname{td}(\bar{x}/e^{\bar{x}}, \ker(F)) \leqslant \dim V - \dim \operatorname{pr}(V) < n - \dim \operatorname{pr}(V).$$

Hence, putting these together,

$$n - \dim \operatorname{pr}(V) + \dim(X) > \dim H$$

which means that X is an atypical component of the intersection, and hence $e^{\bar{x}} \in \operatorname{pr}(V)^{atyp}$ as required. □

2.6. **Consequence of the failure of CIT.** We have seen that if CIT is true then the strong kernel property is first-order axiomatizable. Now we show the converse.

Proposition. *Suppose that CIT is false. Then any $F \in \mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ has an elementary extension without strong kernel.*

Proof. In [Zil02] it is shown that if CIT is false then there is a counterexample defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. So suppose that $W \subseteq \mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}^n$ is a counterexample to CIT, defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. So for each $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there is H_N, an algebraic subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}^n$ of depth strictly greater than N such that

$$\dim(W \cap H_N) > \dim W + \dim H_N - n.$$

There are only finitely many possible values for $\dim H_N$ and for $\dim(W \cap H_N)$, so by passing to a subsequence of the H_N we may assume for some h and t that, for all N, $\dim H_N = h$ and $\dim(W \cap H_N) = t$.

Consider the following formulas $\varphi_N(\bar{x}, \bar{m})$ in free variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$ and $(m_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$:

$$\bigwedge_{i,j=1}^{n} m_{ij} \in Q \wedge M\bar{x} \in \ker^n \wedge \operatorname{rk}(M) = n - h \wedge e^{\bar{x}} \in W$$

$$\wedge \bigwedge_{\bar{\mu} \in \{-N,\dots,N\}^n \setminus \{\bar{0}\}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} e^{\mu_i x_i} \neq 1$$

where Q is the field of fractions of Z, and $M = (m_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$ considered as a matrix.

We show that each $\varphi_N(\bar{x}, \bar{m})$ is satisfiable in F. So take H_N as above, and $\bar{b} \in (W \cap H_N)(F)$, generic in some atypical component of the intersection of dimension t. Choose $M \in \mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{Q})$ such that H is given by $\bar{y}^M = 1$ and choose $\bar{a} \in F^n$ such that $e^{\bar{a}} = \bar{b}$. Then $e^{M\bar{a}} = \bar{1}$, so $M\bar{a} \in \ker(F)^n$. Also $\operatorname{rk}(M) = n - h$ and $e^{\bar{a}} \in W$, but since $\bar{b}$ is generic in $W \cap H_N$ and the depth of H_N is greater than N, we also have $\prod_{i=1}^n e^{\mu_i a_i} \neq 1$ whenever $\bar{\mu} \in \{-N, \dots, N\}^n \setminus \{\bar{0}\}$.

So each $\varphi_N(\bar{x}, \bar{m})$ is satisfiable in F, but then the set of formulas $\{\varphi_N(\bar{x}, \bar{m}) \mid N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is finitely satisfiable, and hence by compactness it is satisfiable in some elementary extension K of F. Say $K \models \varphi_N(\bar{a}, M)$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Then $\operatorname{mrk}(e^{\bar{a}}) = n$, but

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{td}(\bar{a}, e^{\bar{a}}/\ker(K)) &\leqslant \operatorname{td}(\bar{a}/\ker(K)) + \operatorname{td}(e^{\bar{a}}/\ker(K)) \\ &\leqslant \operatorname{ldim}_Q(\bar{a}/\ker(K)) + \operatorname{td}(e^{\bar{a}}) \\ &\leqslant (n - \operatorname{rk} M) + \dim W \\ &\leqslant h + \dim W \\ &< n + t \\ &< n \end{aligned}$$

Thus K does not have strong kernel. □

3. Some algebra of exponential fields

3.1. **Partial E-fields and kernels.** A *partial E-field* is a two-sorted structure

$$\langle F, D(F); +, \cdot, +_D, (q\cdot)_{q \in \mathbb{Q}}, \alpha, \exp_F \rangle$$

where $\langle F; +, \cdot \rangle$ is a field of characteristic zero, $\langle D(F); +_D, (q\cdot)_{q\in\mathbb{Q}} \rangle$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space, $\langle D(F); +_D \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha} \langle F; + \rangle$ is an injective homomorphism of additive groups, and $\langle D(F); +_D \rangle \xrightarrow{\exp_F} \langle F; \cdot \rangle$ is a homomorphism.

We identify $D(F)$ with $\alpha(D(F))$, and hence a (total) E-field is a partial E-field.

Let $I(F) = \{\exp_F(a) \mid a \in D(F)\}$ be the image of the exponential map of F.

We say that a partial (or total) E-field has *full kernel* iff the group $\sqrt{1}$ of all roots of unity is contained in $I(F)$. Consideration of the structure of $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{a}$ and $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}$ as abstract groups shows that F has full kernel iff $\langle \ker(F); +, 0\rangle$ is a model of Presburger arithmetic, the complete theory of $\langle \mathbb{Z}; +, 0\rangle$. Equivalently, $\ker(F)$ is an abelian group A such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, the quotient A/nA is cyclic of order n. See for example [Rot00, Chapter 15] for details.

We say that F has *very full kernel* iff $\ker(F)$ is an algebraically compact model of $\langle \mathbb{Z}; +, 0\rangle$, or equivalently iff it contains the profinite completion $\langle \hat{\mathbb{Z}}; +, \cdot\rangle$ of $\langle \mathbb{Z}; +, \cdot\rangle$ as a pure subgroup.

A *coherent system of roots of unity* is a sequence $(c_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}^+}$ such that $c_1 = 1$ and for each $r, m \in \mathbb{N}^+$ we have $c_{rm}^r = c_m$.

Lemma. *A partial E-field F has very full kernel iff for any coherent system of roots of unity $(c_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}^+}$ there is $a \in D(F)$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$ we have $\exp_F(a/m) = c_m$.*

Proof. Each system $(c_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}^+}$ corresponds to an element of $\hat{\mathbb{Z}}$. $\square$

3.2. Kernel extensions.

Proposition. *Let F be a partial E-field with full kernel, and let A be a subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{a}(F)$ such that $A \cap D(F) = \ker(F)$, and A is a model of Presburger arithmetic. Then there is a unique partial E-field extension F' of F with the same underlying field, such that $D(F')$ is spanned by $D(F) \cup A$ and $\ker(F') = A$.*

Proof. Any element of $D(F')$ is of the form $x = a/m + b$ with $a \in A$, $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$, and $b \in D(F)$. The exponential map $\exp_F$ restricts to a surjection $\frac{1}{m}\ker(F) \longrightarrow \sqrt[m]{1}$, where $\sqrt[m]{1}$ is the group of m^{th} roots of unity. Since A is a model of Presburger arithmetic and a pure extension of $\ker(F)$, this surjection extends uniquely to a homomorphism $\frac{1}{m}A \xrightarrow{\theta} \sqrt[m]{1}$.

Now $\exp_{F'}(x)$ must satisfy

$$\exp_{F'}(x) = \exp_{F'}(a/m)\exp_{F'}(b) = \theta(a/m)\exp_F(b)$$

so $\exp_{F'}$ is unique, and it is well-defined because $A \cap D(F) = \ker(F)$. $\square$

Corollary. *Suppose F is a partial E-field with full kernel, satisfying axiom 2′a: the kernel is a cyclic Z-module. Let τ be a generator. Suppose that R is a subring of F such that $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{a}(R)$ is a model of Presburger arithmetic, and $\tau R \cap D(F) = \ker(F)$. Then there is a unique partial E-field F', with the same underlying field as F, such that $D(F')$ is spanned by $\tau R \cup D(F)$, F' satisfies axiom 2′a, with the same kernel generator τ, and the multiplicative stabilizer of the kernel is R.*

Proof. Immediate from the above Proposition, since axiom $2'$a gives a bijection between $\ker(F)$ and $Z(F)$. $\square$

3.3. The free ELA-extension.

In [Kir11], it is shown that certain countable partial E-fields have well-defined free ELA-extensions. Here we prove the same conclusion replacing the countability and the other hypotheses with the single assumption of very full kernel.

Let A be a subset of a partial E-field F. We write $\langle A\rangle_F$ for the smallest partial E-subfield of F containing A, and $\langle A\rangle_F^{ELA}$ for the smallest partial E-subfield of F containing A which is closed under exponentiation, taking logarithms, and is relatively algebraically closed in F. In particular, if F is an ELA-field then $\langle A\rangle_F^{ELA}$ is the smallest ELA-subfield of F containing $A \cup \ker(F)$.

Proposition. *Suppose that F is a partial E-field with very full kernel, and $F \lhd K$ and $F \lhd M$ are two kernel-preserving strong extensions into ELA-fields. Then $\langle F\rangle_K^{ELA} \cong_F \langle F\rangle_M^{ELA}$. In particular:*

1. *If F is a partial E-field with very full kernel then the free ELA-closure of F, F^{ELA}, is well-defined.*
2. *If F is a partial E-field with very full kernel and $F \lhd K$ is a kernel-preserving extension to an ELA-field then $\langle F\rangle_K^{ELA} \cong_F F^{ELA}$.* $\square$

Proof. First note that (1) and (2) follow at once from the main statement of the theorem, because there does exist some strong ELA-field extension of F with no new kernel elements [Kir11, Construction 2.13].

List $\langle F\rangle_K^{ELA}$ as $(s_{\alpha+1})_{\alpha<\lambda}$ for $\lambda = |\langle F\rangle_K^{ELA}|$, such that for each $\alpha < \lambda$, either

- i) $s_{\alpha+1}$ is algebraic over $F \cup \{s_\beta \mid \beta \leqslant \alpha\}$; or
- ii) $s_{\alpha+1} = \exp_K(a)$ for some $a \in F \cup \{s_\beta \mid \beta \leqslant \alpha\}$; or
- iii) $\exp_K(s_{\alpha+1}) = b$ for some $b \in F \cup \{s_\beta \mid \beta \leqslant \alpha\}$.

This is possible by the definition of $\langle F\rangle_K^{ELA}$.

We will inductively construct chains of partial E-subfields

$$F = K_0 \subseteq K_1 \subseteq K_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq K_\alpha \subseteq \cdots$$

of K and

$$F = M_0 \subseteq M_1 \subseteq M_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq M_\alpha \subseteq \cdots$$

of M, and nested isomorphisms $\theta_\alpha : K_\alpha \to M_\alpha$ such that for each $\alpha < \lambda$ we have $s_\alpha \in K_n$, $K_\alpha \lhd K$ and $M_\alpha \lhd M$.

We start by taking θ_0 to be the identity map on F. Now suppose we have K_β, M_β, and θ_β for all $\beta < \alpha$. If α is a limit, take unions. Now consider $\alpha = \gamma + 1$.

Case 1). $s_{\gamma+1}$ is algebraic over K_γ (including the case where $s_{\gamma+1} \in K_\gamma$). Let $p(X)$ be the minimal polynomial of $s_{\gamma+1}$ over K_γ. The image p^θ of p is an irreducible polynomial over M_γ, so let t be any root of p^θ in M. Let $K_{\gamma+1} = K_\gamma(s_{\gamma+1})$, $M_{\gamma+1} = M_\gamma(t)$, and let $\theta_{\gamma+1}$ be the unique field isomorphism extending θ_γ and sending $s_{\gamma+1}$ to t. We make $K_{\gamma+1}$ and $M_{\gamma+1}$ into partial exponential fields by taking the graph of exponentiation to be the graph of $\exp_K$ or $\exp_M$ intersected with $K_{\gamma+1}^2$ or $M_{\gamma+1}^2$ respectively. Suppose that $(a, \exp_K(a)) \in K_{\gamma+1}^2$. Since $K_\gamma \lhd K$, we have $\operatorname{td}(a, \exp_K(a)/K_\gamma) - \operatorname{ldim}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a/D(K_\gamma)) \geqslant 0$. But $K_{\gamma+1}$ is an algebraic extension of K_γ, so it follows that $\operatorname{ldim}_{\mathbb{Q}}(a/D(K_\gamma)) = 0$, that is, that $a \in D(K_\gamma)$. Hence $D(K_{\gamma+1}) = D(K_\gamma)$. The same argument shows that $D(M_{\gamma+1}) = D(M_\gamma)$. Now if $\bar{x}$ is any tuple from K, we have $\delta(\bar{x}/D(K_{\gamma+1})) = \delta(\bar{x}/D(K_\gamma)) \geqslant 0$, and hence $K_{\gamma+1} \lhd K$, and similarly $M_{\gamma+1} \lhd M$.

Case 2). $s_{\gamma+1}$ is transcendental over K_γ and $s_{\gamma+1} = \exp_K(a)$ for some $a \in K_\gamma$. Let $K_{\gamma+1} = K_\gamma(\sqrt{s_{\gamma+1}})$ and $M_{\gamma+1} = M_\gamma(\sqrt{\exp_M(\theta_\gamma(a))})$. Extend θ_γ by defining $\theta_{\gamma+1}(\exp_K(a/m)) = \exp_M(\theta_\gamma(a)/m)$, and extending to a field isomorphism. This is possible because $s_{\gamma+1}$ is transcendental over K_γ and $\exp_M(\theta_\gamma(a))$ is transcendental over M_γ (the latter because $M_\gamma \lhd M$), and so there is a unique isomorphism type of a coherent system of roots of $s_{\gamma+1}$ over K_γ, and of $\exp_M(\theta_\gamma(a))$ over M_γ. Then $\operatorname{td}(K_{\gamma+1}/K_\gamma) = 1$, $a \in D(K_{\gamma+1}) \smallsetminus D(K_\gamma)$, and $K_\gamma \lhd K$, so $D(K_{\gamma+1})$ is spanned by $D(K_\gamma)$ and a. Similarly, $D(M_{\gamma+1})$ is spanned by $\theta_\gamma(a)$ over $D(M_\gamma)$, so $\theta_{\gamma+1}$ is an isomorphism of partial E-fields.

Now if $\bar{x}$ is any tuple from K, we have

$$\delta(\bar{x}/D(K_{\gamma+1})) = \delta(\bar{x}, a/D(K_\gamma)) - \delta(a/D(K_\gamma)) = \delta(\bar{x}, a/D(K_\gamma)) - 0 \geqslant 0$$

as $K_\gamma \lhd K$, so $K_{\gamma+1} \lhd K$. The same argument shows that $M_{\gamma+1} \lhd M$.

Case 3). Suppose we are not in case 1) or 2). Then $s_{\gamma+1}$ is transcendental over K_γ, not of the form $\exp_K(a)$ for any $a \in K_\gamma$, but $\exp_K(s_{\gamma+1}) = b$ for some $b \in K_\gamma$ by the choice of $s_{\gamma+1}$.

Let $t \in M$ be such that $\exp_M(t) = \theta_\gamma(b)$. Let $K_{\gamma+1} = K_\gamma(s_{\gamma+1}, \sqrt{b})$ and $M_{\gamma+1} = M_\gamma(t, \sqrt{\theta_\gamma(b)})$. Now for $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let

$$c_m = \theta_\gamma(\exp_K(s_{\gamma+1}/m))/\exp_M(t/m).$$

Then $(c_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}^+}$ is a coherent system of roots of unity, and F has very full kernel so, by Lemma 3.1, there is $a \in F$ such that $\exp_F(a/m) = c_m$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Extend θ_γ by defining $\theta_{\gamma+1}(s_{\gamma+1}) = t + a$ and $\theta_{\gamma+1}(\exp_K(s_{\gamma+1}/m)) = \exp_M(\theta_{\gamma+1}(s_\gamma + 1)/m)$ and extending to a field isomorphism. This is possible because $s_{\gamma+1}$ is transcendental over K_γ and (since $M_\gamma \lhd M$) $t + a$ is transcendental over M_γ. Then by construction, $\theta_{\gamma+1}$ is an isomorphism of partial E-fields, and as in Case 2 above, we have $K_{\gamma+1} \lhd K$ and $M_{\gamma+1} \lhd M$.

Conclusion. That completes the induction. Let $K_\lambda = \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda} K_\alpha$. Then $K_\lambda = \langle F\rangle_K^{ELA}$ because K_λ is an ELA-subfield of K containing F and is the smallest such because at each stage we add only elements of K which must lie in every ELA-subfield of K containing F. The union of the maps θ_α gives an embedding of K_λ into M, and, for the same reason, the image must be $\langle F\rangle_M^{ELA}$. Hence $\langle F\rangle_K^{ELA} \cong_F \langle F\rangle_M^{ELA}$ as required. $\square$

3.4. **Strong kernel-preserving extensions.** The finitely generated, strong, kernel-preserving extensions of ELA-fields are explained and classified in sections 3 and 4 of [Kir11]. We state the necessary results from there. Suppose $F \lhd K$ is a kernel-preserving strong extension of ELA-fields with very full kernel, and suppose K is generated by a finite tuple $\bar{x}$ over F. Let $V = \mathrm{Loc}(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}/F)$. We may assume that $\bar{x}$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent over F, equivalently V is *additively free.* Since the extension is kernel-preserving, it follows that no product of integer powers of the e^{x_i} lies in F, equivalently that V is *multiplicatively free.*

Write G for $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{a} \times \mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}$. Each matrix $M \in \mathrm{Mat}_{n\times n}(\mathbb{Z})$ defines a homomorphism $G^n \xrightarrow{M} G^n$ by acting as a linear map on $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{a}^n$ and as a multiplicative map on $\mathbb{G}_\mathrm{m}^n$. For any subvariety $W \subseteq G^n$, we write $M \cdot W$ for its image. An irreducible subvariety W of G^n is *rotund* iff for every matrix $M \in \mathrm{Mat}_{n\times n}(\mathbb{Z})$ we have $\dim M \cdot W \geqslant \mathrm{rk}\, M$. The extension $F \lhd K$ being strong is equivalent to V being rotund. It may be that the locus V does not determine the locus of $(\bar{x}/r, e^{\bar{x}/r})$ over F, for some integers r. Equivalently, the variety $= (rI\cdot)^{-1}V$ may not be irreducible, where rI is the scalar matrix. However, there is some integer m such that, if we replace each generator x_i by x_i/m, then all such varieties are irreducible. We say V is *Kummer-generic.*

Then, as in [Kir11, section 3] but using Proposition 3.3 in place of Theorem 2.18 of [Kir11], K is determined up to isomorphism as an extension of F by V. We write K as $F|V$ (F *extended by* V).

We now see that axiom 4, strong exponential-algebraic closedness, states that given any finite tuple $\bar{a}$ from F, and any finitely generated strong, kernel-preserving ELA-extension $\langle\bar{a}\rangle_F^{ELA} \lhd K$, there is an embedding of K into F over $\langle\bar{a}\rangle_F^{ELA}$. In other words, it is existential closedness within the class of strong kernel-preserving extensions.

3.5. **Semistrong extensions.** Extensions where the kernel extends will not generally be strong. However, much of the technology of strong extensions can be adapted to this broader setting. We define *semistrong* extensions to play the central role.

The predimension function δ and its associated calculus are essential tools when dealing with strong extensions, and there is an analogous calculus for semi-strong extensions.

Definition. Let $F \subseteq F_1$ be an extension of partial E-fields, and $\bar{x}$ a finite tuple from F_1. We define the predimension function

$$\Delta_{F_1}(\bar{x}/F) = \operatorname{td}(\bar{x}, \exp_{F_1}(\bar{x})/F \cup \ker(F_1)) - \operatorname{ldim}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\bar{x} \cap D(F_1)/D(F) \cup \ker(F_1))$$

where $\exp_{F_1}(\bar{x}) = \left\{ \exp_{F_1}(x_i) \mid x_i \in \bar{x} \cap D(F_1) \right\}$.

We define Δ only over partial E-subfields. However, if $\bar{y}$ is a (possibly infinite) tuple from F_1, we can define $\Delta_{F_1}(\bar{x}/\bar{y}) := \Delta_{F_1}(\bar{x}/F)$. where $F = \langle \ker(F) \cup \bar{y} \rangle_{F_1}$, the partial E-subfield of F_1 generated by $\ker(F) \cup \bar{y}$.

The following properties are almost immediate from the definition.

Lemma (Basic properties of the predimension function)**.**

(a) $\Delta_F(\bar{x}/A) = \operatorname{td}(\bar{x}, \exp(\bar{x})/A \cup \ker(F)) - \operatorname{mrk}(\exp_F(\bar{x})/I(A))$

(b) Addition property: for finite tuples $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$,

$$\Delta_F(\bar{x} \cup \bar{y}/A) = \Delta_F(\bar{x}/A \cup \bar{y}) + \Delta_F(\bar{y}/A).$$

(c) Suppose $F_1 \subseteq F_2 \subseteq F_3$ are partial E-fields, that $\bar{x} \in D(F_2)$, and that $F_2 \underset{\ker(F_2)}{\overset{\text{alg}}{\perp}} \ker(F_3)$, which means that every finite tuple $\bar{a} \in F_2$ satisfies $\operatorname{td}(\bar{a}/\ker(F_2) \cup \ker(F_3)) = \operatorname{td}(\bar{a}/\ker(F_2))$. Then $\Delta_{F_3}(\bar{x}/F_1) = \Delta_{F_2}(\bar{x}/F_1)$.

□

Note that the function Δ_F does depends on F, but (c) above gives an important situation where there is no dependence.

Definition. Let $\theta : F \hookrightarrow F_1$ be an extension of partial E-fields. We say that the extension is *semi-strong* and write $F \xhookrightarrow{\prec} F_1$ or just $F \prec F_1$ iff for every $\bar{x} \in F_1$, $\Delta_{F_1}(\bar{x}/\theta(F)) \geqslant 0$, and $F \underset{\ker(F)}{\overset{\text{alg}}{\perp}} \ker(F_1)$.

Lemma (Basic properties of semi-strong extensions)**.**

(a) For any partial E-field F, $F \prec F$

(b) If $F_1 \prec F_2$ and $F_2 \prec F_3$ then $F_1 \prec F_3$.

(c) $A \prec F$ iff for every finite tuple $\bar{x}$ from F, $A \prec \langle A \cup \bar{x} \rangle_F$.

(d) If $F_1 \subseteq F_2$, $F_1 \prec F_3$ and $F_2 \prec F_3$ then $F_1 \prec F_2$.

(e) Suppose $F_1 \subseteq F_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq F_\alpha \subseteq \cdots$ is a chain of partial E-subfields of some partial E-field F, and each $F_\alpha \prec F$. Then $\bigcup_\alpha F_\alpha \prec F$.

(f) If $A \prec F$ is kernel-preserving and semi-strong then it is strong.

□

3.6. **Free ELA-fields and semi-strong extensions.**

Proposition. *Suppose that F is a partial E-field with full kernel, K is an ELA-field with very full kernel, and $\theta : F \prec K$ is a semi-strong embedding. Then θ extends to a semi-strong embedding $\theta^* : F^{ELA} \prec K$. Furthermore, if $\theta(\ker(F)) = \ker(K)$ then $\theta^*(F^{ELA}) = \langle \theta(F) \rangle_K^{ELA}$.*

Note that if $\theta(\ker(F)) \neq \ker(K)$ then the image of F^{ELA} in K will not be uniquely determined by θ. The proof of the Proposition is similar to that of Proposition 3.3.

Proof. List F^{ELA} as $(s_{\alpha+1})_{\alpha<\lambda}$ for $\lambda = |F^{ELA}|$, such that for each $\alpha < \lambda$, either

i) $s_{\alpha+1}$ is algebraic over $F \cup \{s_\beta \mid \beta \leqslant \alpha\}$; or
ii) $s_{\alpha+1} = \exp_K(a)$ for some $a \in F \cup \{s_\beta \mid \beta \leqslant \alpha\}$; or
iii) $\exp_K(s_{\alpha+1}) = b$ for some $b \in F \cup \{s_\beta \mid \beta \leqslant \alpha\}$.

We will inductively construct a chain of partial E-subfields

$$F = F_0 \subseteq F_1 \subseteq F_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq F_\alpha \subseteq \cdots$$

of F^{ELA} and nested semi-strong embeddings $\theta_\alpha : F_\alpha \xhookrightarrow{\prec} K$ such that for each $\alpha < \lambda$ we have $s_\alpha \in F_\alpha$ and $F_\alpha \lhd F^{ELA}$.

We start by taking $\theta_0 = \theta$. Now suppose we have F_β and θ_β for all $\beta < \alpha$. If α is a limit, take unions. By Lemma 3.5(e), $F_\alpha \lhd F^{ELA}$ and $\theta_\alpha(F_\alpha) \prec K$. Now consider $\alpha = \gamma + 1$.

Case 1). $s_{\gamma+1}$ is algebraic over F_γ (including the case where $s_{\gamma+1} \in F_\gamma$). Let $p(X)$ be the minimal polynomial of $s_{\gamma+1}$ over F_γ. The image p^θ of p is an irreducible polynomial over $\theta_\gamma(F_\gamma)$, so let t be any root of p^θ in K. Let $F_{\gamma+1} = F_\gamma(s_{\gamma+1})$ and let $\theta_{\gamma+1}$ be the unique field embedding which extends θ_γ and sends $s_{\gamma+1}$ to t. We make $F_{\gamma+1}$ into a partial exponential field by taking the graph of exponentiation to be the graph of $\exp_{F^{ELA}}$ intersected with $F^2_{\gamma+1}$.

Using the fact that $F_\gamma \lhd F^{ELA}$, it is easy to see that $D(F_{\gamma+1}) = D(F_\gamma)$. Similarly, since $\theta_\alpha(F_\alpha) \prec K$, the graph of $\exp_K$ intersected with $\theta_{\gamma+1}(F_{\gamma+1})^2$ is the same as its intersection with $\theta_\gamma(F_\gamma)^2$, so $\theta_{\gamma+1}$ is an embedding of partial E-fields. By the same argument, $F_{\gamma+1} \lhd F^{ELA}$ and $\theta_{\gamma+1}(F_{\gamma+1}) \prec K$.

Case 2). $s_{\gamma+1}$ is transcendental over F_γ and $s_{\gamma+1} = \exp_F(a)$ for some $a \in F_\gamma$. Let $F_{\gamma+1} = F_\gamma(\sqrt{s_{\gamma+1}})$.

Since $F_\gamma \lhd F^{ELA}$, we see that $s_{\gamma+1}$ is transcendental over F_γ. Since $\theta_\gamma(F_\gamma) \prec K$, we see that $\exp_K(\theta_\gamma(a))$ is transcendental over $\theta_\gamma(F_\gamma) \cup \ker(K)$. Thus there is a unique isomorphism type of a coherent system of roots of $s_{\gamma+1}$ over F_γ, and of $\exp_K(\theta_\gamma(a))$ over $\theta_\gamma(F_\gamma) \cup \ker(K)$, so we may define $\theta_{\gamma+1}(\exp(a/m)) = \exp_K(\theta_\gamma(a)/m)$, and extend uniquely to a field embedding $F_{\gamma+1} \xrightarrow{\theta_{\gamma+1}} K$.

Then $\mathrm{td}(F_{\gamma+1}/F_\gamma) = 1$, $a \in D(F_{\gamma+1}) \smallsetminus D(F_\gamma)$, and $F_\gamma \lhd F^{ELA}$, so $D(F_{\gamma+1})$ is spanned by $D(F_\gamma) \cup \{a\}$. Similarly, $D(\theta_{\gamma+1}(F_{\gamma+1}))$ is spanned by $D(\theta_{\gamma+1}(F_{\gamma+1})) \cup \{\theta_\gamma(a)\}$, so $\theta_{\gamma+1}$ is an embedding of partial E-fields.

Now if $\bar{x}$ is any tuple from F^{ELA}, we have

$$\delta(\bar{x}/F_{\gamma+1}) = \delta(\bar{x}, a/F_\gamma) - \delta(a/F_\gamma) = \delta(\bar{x}, a/F_\gamma) - 0 \geqslant 0$$

because $F_\gamma \lhd F^{ELA}$, and so $F_{\gamma+1} \lhd F$. A similar argument replacing δ by Δ_K shows that $\theta_{\gamma+1}(F_{\gamma+1}) \prec K$.

Case 3). Suppose we are not in case 1) or 2). Then $s_{\gamma+1}$ is transcendental over F_γ and not of the form $\exp_{F^{ELA}}(a)$ for any $a \in F_\gamma$, but $\exp_{F^{ELA}}(s_{\gamma+1}) = b$ for some $b \in F_\gamma$. Let $F_{\gamma+1} = F_\gamma(s_{\gamma+1}, \sqrt{b})$.

Consider the sequence $(a_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}^+} = (\exp_{F^{ELA}}(s_{\gamma+1}/m))_{m\in\mathbb{N}^+}$ of roots of b. Choose a coherent sequence $(c_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}^+}$ of roots of $\theta_\gamma(b)$ in K such that $c_m = \theta_\gamma(a_m)$ for any m with $a_m \in F_\gamma$.

Since K has very full kernel, there is $t \in K$ such that $\exp_K(t/m) = c_m$, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$. As $\theta_\gamma(F_\gamma) \prec K$, t is transcendental over $\theta_\gamma(F_\gamma) \cup \ker(K)$. Thus we can extend θ_γ by defining $\theta_{\gamma+1}(s_{\gamma+1}) = t$ and $\theta_{\gamma+1}(a_m) = c_m$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and extending to a field embedding. As in case 2, $\theta_{\gamma+1}$ is an embedding of partial E-fields, $F_{\gamma+1} \prec F^{ELA}$, and $\theta_{\gamma+1}(F_{\gamma+1}) \prec K$.

Conclusion. That completes the induction. Let $\theta^* = \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda} \theta_\alpha$. By Lemma 3.5(e), θ^* is a semi-strong embedding of F^{ELA} into K.

Now suppose $\theta(\ker(F)) = \ker(K)$. Then for each $b \in \theta^*(F^{ELA})$ and each $a \in K$ such that $\exp_K(a) = b$, we have $a \in \theta^*(F^{ELA})$. So in this case $\theta^*(F^{ELA}) = \langle \theta(F) \rangle_K^{ELA}$ as required.

□

4. THE CLASS $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$

4.1. **Axioms.** Recall from the introduction that $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$(Exponentially Closed Fields with Strong Kernel) is the class of exponential fields F satisfying the following axioms:

1: F is an ELA-field.
2′a: The kernel is a cyclic Z-module.
2′b: Every element of the kernel is transcendental over Z.
2′c: Theory of true arithmetic
3′: Strong kernel
4: Strong exponential-algebraic closedness

We have seen unconditionally that these axioms are $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-expressible, so unconditionally $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ is an $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$-class. Later we will see conditionally on CIT that $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ is an elementary class.

Lemma. $\mathbf{ECF_{SK}} \subseteq \mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$.

Proof. Axioms 1, 2a, 2b, and 4 are common to both classes. Standard kernel certainly implies 2′c, and standard kernel together with axiom 3 (the Schanuel property) implies axiom 3′ (strong kernel). □

4.2. **Saturation over the kernel.** We give a stronger version of SEAC, incorporating some saturation.

Definition. Let λ be an infinite cardinal. An ELA-field F is said to satisfy λ-SEAC iff, whenever V is a rotund, additively and multiplicatively free subvariety of G^n defined over F and of dimension n, and A is a subset of F with $|A| < \lambda$, then there is $\bar{x}$ in F such that $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \in V$ and is generic in V over A.

Note that $\aleph_0$-SEAC is the same as SEAC, and that $\aleph_1$-SEAC is incompatible with the Countable Closure Property.

Definition. An ELA-field F is *λ-saturated over its kernel* iff $\operatorname{etd}(F) \geqslant \lambda$ and $F \models \lambda$-SEAC. F is *saturated over its kernel* iff it is $|F|$-saturated over its kernel.

Proposition. *Let $F \in \mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$. Then there is a kernel-preserving strong extension $F \lhd F'$ with $F' \in \mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$, $|F'| = |F|$, and such that F' is saturated over its kernel.*

Proof. From Proposition 3.4, there are only $|F|$-many finitely generated kernel-preserving, strong ELA-extensions of F, and the extensions amalgamate freely by [Kir11, Lemma 4.11], so a standard construction gives F' as the union of a chain of length $|F| \times \omega$. ☐

4.3. **Uniqueness and homogeneity.**

Theorem. *Suppose $F, M \in \mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$, both with very full kernel, and suppose $|F| = |M| = \lambda > 2^{\aleph_0}$ and both F and M satisfy λ-SEAC. Suppose that we have an isomorphism $\theta_Z : Z(F) \xrightarrow{\cong} Z(M)$, and that $\operatorname{etd}(F) = \operatorname{etd}(M)$, and we have a bijection $\theta_B : B_F \xrightarrow{\cong} B_M$ between exponential transcendence bases of F and M. Suppose furthermore that $F_{00} \prec F$ and $M_{00} \prec M$ are semistrong partial E-subfields or the empty set, with $|F_{00}| = |M_{00}| < \lambda$ and that $\theta_{00} : F_{00} \xrightarrow{\cong} M_{00}$ is an isomorphism which is compatible with θ_Z and with θ_B (that is, the functions agree where more than one is defined).*

Then there is an isomorphism $\theta : F \xrightarrow{\cong} M$ extending $\theta_Z \cup \theta_B \cup \theta_{00}$.

Proof. List F as $(a_{\mu+1})_{\mu<\lambda}$ and list M as $(b_{\mu+1})_{\mu<\lambda}$. We construct chains $(F_\mu)_{\mu<\lambda}$ and $(M_\mu)_{\mu<\lambda}$ of ELA-subfields of F and M respectively and isomorphisms $\theta_\mu : F_\mu \xrightarrow{\cong} M_\mu$ such that

(i) $F_\mu \prec F$ and $M_\mu \prec M$;
(ii) $Z(F_\mu) \preccurlyeq Z(F)$ and $Z(M_\mu) \preccurlyeq Z(M)$;
(iii) $|F_\mu| < \lambda$;
(iv) θ_μ is compatible with $\theta_Z \cup \theta_B$; and
(v) If μ is a successor ordinal, then $a_\mu \in F_\mu$ and $b_\mu \in M_\mu$.

Base step. Note that SK embeds semi-strongly in all members of $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$, uniquely up to choice of $\pm\tau$, so if $F_{00} = \emptyset$ we may redefine $F_{00} = M_{00} = SK$ and choose an isomorphism θ_{00}. So we reduce to the case where $F_{00} \neq \emptyset$.

By the downwards Löwenheim-Skolem theorem, we can find $Z(F_0) \preccurlyeq Z(F)$ with $Z(F_{00}) \subseteq Z(F_0)$, $Z(F_0)$ algebraically compact, and $|Z(F_0)| <$

λ. Take $Z(M_0) = \theta_Z(Z(F_0))$. By Corollary 3.2, the partial E-subfields F_0' of F and M_0' of M generated by $F_{00} \cup Z(F_0)$ and $M_{00} \cup Z(M_0)$ respectively are isomorphic, and there is an isomorphism θ_0' extending θ_{00} and compatible with θ_Z.

By Proposition 3.6, the isomorphism θ_0' extends to an isomorphism $\theta_0 : F_0 \xrightarrow{\cong} M_0$ for some $F_0 \prec F$, with $F_0 \cong (F_0')^{ELA}$ and $M_0 \prec M$, with $M_0 \cong (M_0')^{ELA}$. The relevant clauses from (i)—(v) hold immediately.

Limit steps. If μ is a limit ordinal, let $F_\mu = \bigcup_{\nu<\mu} F_\nu$, $M_\mu = \bigcup_{\nu<\mu} M_\nu$, and $\theta_\mu = \bigcup_{\nu<\mu} \theta_\nu$. The clauses (i)—(v) are preserved.

Successor steps. Suppose $\mu = \nu + 1$. Since $F_\nu \prec F$ and B_F is an exponential transcendence base of F, there are finite tuples $\bar{a} \subseteq F$ containing a_μ, $\bar{b} \subseteq B_F \smallsetminus F_\nu$ and $\bar{c} \subseteq \ker(F)$ such that

$$\operatorname{td}(\bar{a}, e^{\bar{a}}/F_\nu, \bar{c}, \bar{b}, e^{\bar{b}}) - \operatorname{mrk}(e^{\bar{a}}/F_\nu, e^{\bar{b}}) = 0.$$

Choose $Z(F_\mu) \preccurlyeq Z(F)$ with $Z(F_\nu) \cup \bar{c} \subseteq Z(F_\mu)$, and $|Z(F_\mu)| < \lambda$. Let $Z(M_\mu) = \theta_Z(Z(F_\mu))$.

As in the base step, using Corollary 3.2 and Proposition 3.6, we can extend θ_ν to an isomorphism of ELA-fields $\theta_\mu' : F_\mu' \xrightarrow{\cong} M_\mu'$, with $Z(F_\mu') = Z(F_\mu)$ and $Z(M_\mu') = Z(M_\mu)$. Let $r = |\bar{b}|$. The isomorphism type of the partial E-field extension generated by an exponentially transcendental r-tuple is uniquely defined, so θ_μ' extends to an isomorphism $\langle F_\mu' \cup \bar{b} \rangle_F \cong \langle M_\mu' \cup \theta_B(\bar{b}) \rangle_M$, compatible with θ_B. Hence by Proposition 3.6 again, we may extend θ_μ' to an isomorphism

$$\theta_\mu'' : F_\mu'' \xrightarrow{\cong} M_\mu''$$

where $(\langle F_\mu' \cup \bar{b} \rangle_F)^{ELA} \cong F_\mu'' \prec F$ and $(\langle M_\mu' \cup \theta_B(\bar{b}) \rangle_M)^{ELA} \cong M_\mu'' \prec M$.

Now we may take $\bar{a}$ to be a finite tuple of minimal size n such that $a_\mu \in \langle F_\mu'' \cup \bar{a} \rangle_F$ and $\langle F_\mu'' \cup \bar{a} \rangle_F \prec F$. Since F_μ'' is an ELA-subfield of F and $\bar{a}$ is algebraically free from the kernel of F over the kernel of F_μ'', $V := \operatorname{Loc}(\bar{a}, e^{\bar{a}}/F_\mu'')$ is additively and multiplicatively free. Since $F_\mu'' \prec F$, we therefore have that V is rotund, and since $\operatorname{etd}(\bar{a}/F_\mu'') = 0$, we have that $\dim V = n$. As a field F_μ'' is algebraically closed, so, as discussed in section 3.4, replacing $\bar{a}$ by $\bar{a}/m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$ if necessary, the partial E-field extension $F_\mu'' \subseteq \langle F_\mu'' \cup \bar{a} \rangle_F$ is determined up to isomorphism over F_μ'' by V. Now $M \models \lambda$-SEAC, so there is $\bar{d} \in M$ such that $(\bar{d}, e^{\bar{d}}) \in V^\theta$, generic over M_μ'', where V^θ is the subvariety of $G^n(M)$ corresponding to V under θ_μ''.

Then θ_μ'' extends to an isomorphism $\langle F_\mu'' \cup \bar{a} \rangle_F \xrightarrow{\cong} \langle M_\mu'' \cup \bar{d} \rangle_M$, and, by Proposition 3.6 again, to $\theta_\mu''' : F_\mu''' \xrightarrow{\cong} M_\mu'''$ where

$$(\langle F_\mu'' \cup \bar{a} \rangle_F)^{ELA} \cong F_\mu''' \prec F \quad \text{and} \quad (\langle M_\mu'' \cup \bar{d} \rangle_M)^{ELA} \cong M_\mu''' \prec M.$$

Now F_μ''' and M_μ''' satisfy (i)—(iv) and $a_\mu \in F_\mu'''$. Repeat the process swapping the roles of F and M and starting with F_μ''' in place of M_ν and M_μ''' in place of F_ν to get $\theta_\mu : F_\mu \xrightarrow{\cong} M_\mu$, satisfying (i)—(v).

Conclusion. That completes the induction steps. Now $\theta := \bigcup_{\mu<\lambda} \theta_\mu$ is an isomorphism $\theta : F \xrightarrow{\cong} M$, extending $\theta_Z \cup \theta_B \cup \theta_{00}$ as required. □

By a more careful back-and-forth analysis, one can weaken the condition that $\lambda > 2^{\aleph_0}$ to $\lambda \geqslant 2^{\aleph_0}$, which is automatically true since F and M have very full kernel.

4.4. **Superstability over the kernel.** Let $R \models \mathrm{Th}(\mathbb{Z}; +, \cdot)$ be algebraically compact, and consider the subclass

$$\mathbf{ECF}_R = \{F \in \mathbf{ECF}_{\mathbf{StrK}} \mid Z(F) = R\}.$$

Theorem 4.3 tells us that saturation within the class $\mathbf{ECF}_R$ is the same as what we have called saturation over the kernel. So, by Proposition 4.2, for each cardinal $\lambda \geqslant |R|$, there is a unique model of cardinality λ that is saturated within the class, and using Theorem 4.3 again we see it is homogeneous (at least after adding parameters for all elements of R). Thus the class $\mathbf{ECF}_R$ has a monster model M which is a homogeneous structure, and which is λ-stable (that is, it realises only λ types over any set of size λ) for all $\lambda \geqslant |R|$. Hence $\mathbf{ECF}_R$ is a *homogeneous class* in the sense of [HS00]. Furthermore, by Theorem 1.17 of that paper, the cardinal invariant $\kappa(M)$ is equal to $\aleph_0$, and hence by definition (see Lemma 5.1 of that paper), the classes $\mathbf{ECF}_R$ are superstable. We can say informally that the class $\mathbf{ECF}_{\mathbf{StrK}}$ is *superstable over the kernel.* There is a general theory of superstability in homogeneous classes, in close parallel to that for first-order theories.

5. Complete elementary theory

In this section we show that, if the conjecture CIT is true, then the class $\mathbf{ECF}_{\mathbf{StrK}}$ is an elementary class, and furthermore its elementary theory is complete.

5.1. **First-order axioms.** We have seen that axioms 1 and 2′ are first-order expressible. From 2.5 we know that, if CIT is true, axiom 3’ (strong kernel) is also first-order expressible.

Lemma. *The following scheme is first-order expressible and expresses axiom 4 (strong exponential-algebraic closedness), assuming axioms 1, 2′, and 3′.*

For every $n, r \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and every irreducible, rotund, multiplicatively free subvariety V of G^n defined over F and of dimension n, the axiom:

$$(\forall \bar{b})(\exists \bar{x})(\forall \bar{m} \in Z^{n+r})(\forall t \in \ker)(\forall (\bar{w},\bar{y}) \in V)$$
$$\left[(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \in V \wedge \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^{r} m_{i+r} b_i = t \to \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i w_i + \sum_{i=1}^{r} m_{i+r} b_i = t \right] \right]$$

which states that for each $\bar{b}$ there is $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \in V$ with $\bar{x}$ not satisfying any Z-linear dependencies over $\bar{b}$ and the kernel except those which hold on all of V.

Proof. It is well-known (part of the *fibre dimension theorem*) that when V varies in a parametric family, the set of parameters such that V is irreducible and of dimension n is first-order definable in the field language. Theorem 3.2 of [Zil05] shows that rotundity and multiplicative freeness are also first-order definable in the field language. So the axiom scheme is first-order expressible.

Now suppose that V, $\bar{b}$, and $\bar{x}$ are as given. If V happens also to be additively free then $\bar{x}$ does not satisfy any $\mathbb{Z}$-linear dependencies over $\bar{b}$ and the kernel , and hence $e^{\bar{x}}$ is multiplicatively independent over $e^{\bar{b}}$. Thus, using strong kernel and extending $\bar{b}$ if necessary so that $\bar{b} \prec F$ and V is defined over $\bar{b}$, we deduce that $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}})$ has transcendence degree n over $\bar{b} \cup e^{\bar{b}} \cup \ker$, and hence in particular it is generic in V over $\bar{b}$. So the axiom scheme implies the SEAC property.

For the converse, suppose that $F \in \mathbf{ECF}_{\mathbf{StrK}}$, that $V \subseteq G^n$ is irreducible, rotund, additively and multiplicatively free, and of dimension n, and that $\bar{b} \in F^r$. Extend $\bar{b}$ such that $\bar{b} \prec F$ and V is defined over $\bar{b}$. Then the SEAC property gives $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \in V$, generic over $\bar{b} \cup e^{\bar{b}}$. In particular, since V is multiplicatively free, we have $\operatorname{mrk}(e^{\bar{x}}/e^{\bar{b}}) = n$. So, since $\bar{b} \prec F$, we deduce that $\operatorname{td}(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}/\bar{b}, e^{\bar{b}}, \ker(F)) = n$, and hence $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}})$ is generic in V over $\bar{b} \cup \ker(F)$. Now $Z(F)$ is algebraic over $\ker(F)$, and thus $\bar{x}$ satisfies no $Z(F)$-linear dependencies over $\bar{b} \cup \ker(F)$, except those holding on all of V. So the SEAC scheme holds on F. □

5.2. **Exponential algebraicity and exponential transcendence.**

In any (partial) exponential field F there is a pregeometry called exponential algebraic closure, which we write ecl^F. We give a quick account of its definition. Details can be found in [Kir10]. An exponential polynomial (without iterations of exponentiation) is a function of the form $f(\bar{X}) = p(\bar{X}, e^{\bar{X}})$ where $p \in F[X_1, \ldots, X_n, Y_1, \ldots, Y_n]$ is a polynomial. We can extend the formal differentiation of polynomials to exponential polynomials in a unique way such that $\frac{\partial e^X}{\partial X} = e^X$.

A *Khovanskii system* (of equations and inequations) consists of, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, exponential polynomials $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ with equations

$$f_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n$$

and the inequation

$$\begin{vmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial X_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial X_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial X_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial X_n} \end{vmatrix} (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \neq 0.$$

where the differentiation here is the formal differentiation of exponential polynomials. We say n is the *width* of the Khovanski system.

For any subset C of F, we define $a \in \mathrm{ecl}^F(C)$ iff there are $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in F$, and exponential polynomials $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ with coefficients from $\mathbb{Q}(C)$ such that $a = a_1$ and $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is a solution to the Khovanskii system given by the f_i.

We say that $\mathrm{ecl}^F(C)$ is the *exponential algebraic closure* of C in F. If $a \in \mathrm{ecl}^F(C)$ we say that a is *exponentially algebraic* over C in F, and otherwise that it is *exponentially transcendental* over C in F.

Fact ([Kir10, Theorem 1.1])**.** *Exponential algebraic closure* ecl^F *is a pregeometry in any partial exponential field* F*.*

The above definition of ecl^F makes sense in any partial exponential field. A different definition is used in [Zil05], which makes sense only in partial exponential fields with the Schanuel property, that is, where axiom 2 holds. However, the two definitions agree in that case by [Kir10, Theorem 1.3], which also tells us the following.

Fact. *Let* $F \in \mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$*,* $A \prec F$ *and* $\bar{b}$ *be a finite tuple from* F*. Then*

$$\mathrm{etd}^F(\bar{b}/A) = \min\left\{\Delta_F(\bar{b} \cup \bar{c}/A) \mid \bar{c} \text{ is a finite tuple from } F\right\}$$

5.3. Infinite exponential transcendence degree.

Proposition. *Suppose* $F \in \mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ *is* λ*-saturated, and* $A \subseteq F$ *is an exponential subfield of size less than* λ*. Then* F *contains an element* b *which is exponentially transcendental over* A*. In particular,* $\mathrm{etd}(F) \geqslant \lambda$*.*

Proof. Extend A if necessary such that $A \prec F$. For an n-tuple $\bar{f}$ of exponential polynomials (without iterations of exponentiation), consider the formula $\chi_{\bar{f}}(\bar{x})$ given by

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 0 \wedge \begin{vmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial X_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial X_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial X_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial X_n} \end{vmatrix} (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \neq 0.$$

The type of an exponentially transcendental element x over A is given by all the formulas

$$\neg\exists x_2, \ldots, x_n[\chi_{\bar{f}}(x, x_2, \ldots, x_n)]$$

where $\bar{f}$ ranges over all finite lists of exponential polynomials with coefficients from A.

Since F is λ-saturated, we just have to show that this type is finitely satisfied inside F. Given a finite set of such formulas, let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be greater than the width of any of the corresponding Khovanskii systems. Let $b \in F$ be such that $b = \exp^N(b)$, and $(\exp^r(b))_{r=1,\ldots,N}$ are algebraically independent over A. Such a b exists by axiom 4 (strong exponential-algebraic closedness) and saturation. Suppose that $F_0 \subseteq F$ is a partial E-subfield, containing $A \cup \{b\}$, such that $D(F_0)$ is spanned over $D(A)$ by $b, c_2, \ldots, c_n$. Then for some $r = 1, \ldots, N-1$, we have $\exp^r(b) \notin D(F_0)$. Thus $\Delta(\{\exp^r(b) \mid r = 1, \ldots, N\} / A \cup \bar{c}) < 0$, but since $A \prec F$ we have $\Delta(\{\exp^r(b) \mid r = 1, \ldots, N\} \cup \bar{c}/A) \geqslant 0$, and hence by the addition rule we have $\Delta(\bar{c}/A) > 0$. Thus $\operatorname{etd}^{F_0}(b/A) = 1$. So $F_0 \models \neg\chi_{\bar{f}}(b, c_2, \ldots, c_n)$ for each $\bar{f}$ of length less than N.

Thus also $F \models \neg\chi_{\bar{f}}(b, c_2, \ldots, c_n)$ because $\chi_{\bar{f}}(\bar{x})$ is a quantifier-free formula in the language of partial exponential fields.

Hence $F \models \neg\exists x_2, \ldots, x_n[\chi_{\bar{f}}(b, x_2, \ldots, x_n)]$ for each $\bar{f}$ of length less than N, and in particular for each in the finite set we chose. Hence F finitely satisfies the type of an element b exponentially transcendental over A, so by λ-saturation such a b exists in F. In particular, any exponentially algebraically independent subset of F of size less than λ can be extended, and hence $\operatorname{etd}(F) \geqslant \lambda$. $\square$

5.4. **The completeness proof.**

Theorem. *Assuming CIT, the first-order theory of* $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$*, given by axioms 1, 2', 3', and 4, is complete.*

Proof. Assume CIT. So $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ is an elementary class. Let λ be a cardinal such that $\lambda = \sup\{2^\mu \mid \mu < \lambda\}$ and $\lambda > 2^{\aleph_0}$, and let F, M be special models of cardinality λ. That is, we can write $F = \bigcup_{\mu<\lambda} F_\mu$ and $M = \bigcup_{\mu<\lambda} M_\mu$, where F_μ and M_μ are μ^+-saturated and form elementary chains. Every complete theory has exactly one special model of cardinality λ [CK90, 5.1.8, 5.1.17], so it is enough to show that $F \cong M$.

$Z(F)$ and $Z(M)$ are reducts of F and M, so, by [CK90, Proposition 5.1.6(v)], they are special models of $\operatorname{Th}(\mathbb{Z}; +, \cdot)$. They are both of cardinality λ, and hence they are isomorphic. Note in particular that $Z(F)$ is $\aleph_0$-saturated, so F and M have very full kernel.

Since F_μ is μ^+-saturated it has exponential transcendence degree at least μ^+ by Proposition 5.3, so there is an exponentially-algebraically independent subset $B \subseteq F_\mu$ of cardinality μ^+. Being exponentially-algebraically independent is a type-definable property as is shown in the proof of 5.3, so B is still exponentially-algebraically independent as a subset of F. Thus $\operatorname{etd}(F) \geqslant \mu^+$ for each $\mu < \lambda$, and so $\operatorname{etd}(F) \geqslant \lambda$. Since $|F| = \lambda$ we have $\operatorname{etd}(F) = \lambda$.

Now we show that F has λ-SEAC. Let $A \subseteq F$ be a subset with $|A| = \mu < \lambda$, and let $V \subseteq G^n$ be rotund, and additively and multiplicatively free. By replacing A by a larger subset (of the same cardinality) we may assume that A is semistrong in F. Now F_μ is μ^+-saturated and so satisfies μ^+-SEAC, and hence there are $\bar{b}_\nu$ for $\nu < \mu^+$ with $(\bar{b}_\nu, e^{\bar{b}_\nu}) \in V$, algebraically independent of each other (over the field of definition of V). So, in particular, all the $e^{b_{\nu,i}}$ for $\nu < \mu^+$ and $i = 1, \ldots, n$ are multiplicatively independent. Since $|A| = \mu < \mu^+$, there must be some ν_0 such that $e^{\bar{b}_{\nu_0}}$ is multiplicatively independent over $\exp(A)$. But since A is semistrong, $\operatorname{td}(\bar{b}_{\nu_0}, e^{\bar{b}_{\nu_0}}/A, \exp(A)) \geqslant \operatorname{mrk}(e^{\bar{b}_{\nu_0}}/\exp(A)) = n$ and hence $(\bar{b}_{\nu_0}, e^{\bar{b}_{\nu_0}})$ is generic in V over A, as required.

The same arguments show that $\operatorname{etd}(M) = \lambda$ and that $M \models \lambda$-SEAC. Thus, by Theorem 4.3, there is an isomorphism $F \cong M$. □

5.5. **Exponential-algebraic closedness.** An ELA-field F is said to be *exponentially-algebraically closed*, or EAC, iff for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and every rotund subvariety V of G^n defined over F there is $\bar{x}$ in F such that $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \in V$. The EAC property is clearly first-order axiomatizable, since rotundity is definable.

The next two lemmas summarize some variant but equivalent statements of exponential-algebraic closedness.

Lemma (a)**.** *Let F be an ELA-field of infinite transcendence degree (for example, satisfying the strong kernel axiom). Then $F \models$ EAC iff for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and every rotund subvariety V of G^n defined over F which is*

(i) irreducible;
(ii) of dimension n;
(iii) multiplicatively free; and
(iv) additively free

*there is $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \in V$. In particular, if $F \in$ **ECF**$_{\mathbf{StrK}}$ then $F \models$ EAC.*

Proof. The ⇒ direction is immediate. For the ⇐ direction, we consider (i)—(iv) in turn.

For (i), a reducible V is rotund by definition iff some irreducible component of it is rotund. For (ii), if $V \subseteq G^n$ is rotund but $\dim V > n$, choose $a_1, \ldots, a_{2n} \in F$, algebraically independent over the field of definition of V, and let X be the generic hyperplane in G^n given by the equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i x_i + a_{n+i} y_i = 1$$

Then for any $M \in \operatorname{Mat}_{n\times n}(\mathbb{Z})$, with $\operatorname{rk}(M) < n$, we have

$$\dim M \cdot (V \cap X) = \max(\dim M \cdot V, \operatorname{rk} M)$$

so $V \cap X$ is rotund. (For more details see for example a similar proof in [Kir09, pp464–465].) Since $\dim(V \cap X) = \dim V - 1$, we are done by induction on $\dim V - n$.

For (iii), suppose V is not multiplicatively free. If $n = 1$ then V has the form $y = c$ for some $c \in \mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}(F)$. Since F is an ELA-field, there is $a \in F$ be such that $\exp_F(a) = c$, and $(a, c) \in V$. If $n > 1$, then there are $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all zero, and $c \in \mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}(F)$ such that a point $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ of V which is generic over F satisfies $\prod_{i=1}^n y_i^{m_i} = c$. Since V is rotund, $\sum_{i=1}^n m_i x_i$ is transcendental over F. Let $V' = V \cap \langle \sum_{i=1}^n m_i x_i = a \rangle$ where $\exp_F(a) = c$. Then $\dim V' = \dim V - 1$. Assume without loss of generality that $m_n \neq 0$. Consider the $n-1 \times n$ matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and let $V'' = M \cdot V' \subseteq G^{n-1}$. Then $\dim V'' = \dim V'$, and indeed for any $M' \in \mathrm{Mat}_{n-1 \times n-1}(\mathbb{Z})$, we have

$$\dim M' \cdot V'' = \dim \begin{pmatrix} M' & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot V \geqslant \mathrm{rk}\, M'$$

since V is rotund, and hence V'' is rotund. By induction on n, there are $a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in F$ such that $(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}, e^{a_1}, \ldots, e^{a_{n-1}}) \in V''$, and then taking a_n such that $\sum_{i=1}^n m_i a_i = a$ we have $(\bar{a}, e^{\bar{a}}) \in V$.

The proof of *(iv)* is similar to *(iii)*. □

The hypothesis that F has infinite transcendence degree is harmless from our point of view, but recent work by Vincenzo Mantova suggests that it is unnecessary, because a suitably generic substitute for the generic hyperplane X can be found by other means.

The condition shown in the next lemma to be equivalent to EAC is in fact the original definition of EAC from [Zil05].

Lemma (b). *Let F be an ELA-field of infinite transcendence degree. Then $F \models$ EAC iff for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and every irreducible rotund subvariety V of G^n and every proper (not necessarily irreducible) subvariety $V' \subseteq V$, there is $(\bar{x}, e^{\bar{x}}) \in V \smallsetminus V'$.*

Proof. This time the $\Leftarrow$ direction is immediate. We use the classical Rabinovich trick for the $\Rightarrow$ direction. Suppose V is given by polynomial equations $f_i(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$, and V' is given by equations $g_i(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, s$. In fact it is enough to consider the case $s = 1$, since then we can iterate the construction. So we assume V' given by $g(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = 0$.

Consider the variety $W \subseteq G^{n+1}$ given by the equations $f_i(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$ and $g(\bar{x}, \bar{y})u = 1$, where u is the coordinate for an extra $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{a}}$, and we also consider a coordinate v for the corresponding $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}$.

It is enough to show that W is rotund, since then by EAC there are $a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1} \in F$ such that $(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}, e^{a_1}, \ldots, e^{a_{n+1}}) \in W$, and hence $(a_1, \ldots, a_n, e^{a_1}, \ldots, e^{a_n}) \in V \smallsetminus V'$.

Clearly $\dim W = \dim V + 1$, because the variable u is constrained but the variable v is unconstrained. Now let $M \in \mathrm{Mat}_{n+1 \times n+1}(\mathbb{Z})$, let $(\alpha, \beta) \in M \cdot W$ be generic over F (with $\alpha \in \mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{a}}^{n+1}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{m}}^{n+1}$), and let $(\bar{a}, c, \bar{b}, d)$ be generic over $F \cup (\alpha, \beta)$ in the fibre of (α, β) of the map

$W \twoheadrightarrow M \cdot W$, where $\bar{a}$ is the tuple of values of the coordinates $\bar{x}$, $\bar{b}$ is the values of $\bar{y}$, c is the value of u, and d is the value of v.

Say $M = (M_1|M_2)$, where M_1 is an $(n+1) \times n$ matrix, and M_2 is an $(n+1) \times 1$ matrix. Then we have $M \cdot (\bar{a}c, \bar{b}d) = (\alpha, \beta)$, or equivalently

$$M_1\bar{a} = \alpha - M_2 c =: \gamma \qquad \text{and} \qquad \bar{b}^{M_1} = \beta / d^{M_2} =: \delta.$$

Now (α, β) is generic in $M \cdot W$ over F, and it follows that (γ, δ) is generic in $M_1 \cdot V$ over F, and indeed $(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ is a generic point of the fibre of (γ, δ) of the map $V \twoheadrightarrow M_1 \cdot V$. Thus, by the fibre dimension theorem, and rotundity of V we have

$$\operatorname{td}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}/F, \gamma, \delta) = \dim V - \dim M_1 \cdot V \leqslant \dim V - \operatorname{rk} M_1.$$

Now $\operatorname{td}(c, d/F, \gamma, \delta, \bar{a}, \bar{b}) \leqslant 1$, and $\operatorname{rk} M \geqslant \operatorname{rk} M_1$, so

$$\operatorname{td}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, c, d/F, \gamma, \delta) \leqslant \dim V + 1 - \operatorname{rk} M = \dim W - \operatorname{rk} M$$

but also $\operatorname{td}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, c, d/F, \gamma, \delta) = \operatorname{td}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, c, d/F, \alpha, \beta)$, which is the dimension of a generic fibre of $W \twoheadrightarrow M \cdot W$ so by the fibre dimension theorem again we have $\dim M \cdot W \geqslant \operatorname{rk} M$. Hence W is rotund, as required. □

Theorem. *Assuming CIT, the theory* $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ *is axiomatized by axioms 1, 2′, 3′, and EAC.*

Proof. Suppose that F satisfies axioms 1, 2′, 3′, and EAC, and is $\aleph_0$-saturated. (CIT is implicitly needed here, since otherwise there are no $\aleph_0$-saturated models of axiom 3′.) Suppose $V \subseteq G^n$ is rotund, additively and multiplicatively free, and of dimension n. Then, since F has strong kernel, for each finite tuple $\bar{b} \in F$ there is a finite tuple $\bar{c}$ such that V is defined over $\bar{c}$, $\bar{c} \prec F$, and $\bar{b} \subseteq e^{\bar{c}}$. Then by EAC, Lemma (b) above, and $\aleph_0$-saturation, there is $\bar{a}$ such that $(\bar{a}, e^{\bar{a}}) \in V$ and $e^{\bar{a}}$ is multiplicatively free over $e^{\bar{c}}$. By strong kernel again, $(\bar{a}, e^{\bar{a}})$ is generic in V over $\bar{b}$. Thus, using Lemma (a), the two sets of axioms (1, 2′, 3′, and SEAC, and 1, 2′, 3′, and EAC), have the same $\aleph_0$-saturated models. But (assuming CIT), they are both lists of first-order axioms, and hence they have the same models. □

6. Corollaries of CIT

Theorem. *Assume CIT is true, so* $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ *is a complete first-order theory. Then:*

(1) *$\mathbb{Z}$ is stably embedded in the pseudo-exponential fields. More precisely, the definable set Z is stably embedded in the theory* $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$*, that is, every subset of Z^n which is definable (with parameters) in the theory* $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ *is also definable with parameters in Z, and hence is definable (with parameters) in the theory* $\operatorname{Th}(\mathbb{Z}; +, \cdot)$*.*

(2) $\mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ *has quantifier elimination in the language $\langle +, \cdot, \exp \rangle$ expanded by predicates for every definable subset of $\mathbb{Z}$ and for all $\exists$-formulas.*

(3) If $F \subseteq M$ with $F, M \in \mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$, then $F \preccurlyeq M$ iff $Z(F) \preccurlyeq Z(M)$ and $F \prec M$.

(4) Let $R_1, R_2 \models \mathrm{Th}(\mathbb{Z}; +, \cdot)$, and suppose $\theta_R : R_1 \hookrightarrow R_2$ is a ring embedding such that R_1 is relatively algebraically closed in R_2. Then there are $F_1, F_2 \in \mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ with $Z(F_i) = R_i\tau$ and a semistrong embedding $\theta : F_1 \prec F_2$ extending θ_R. If θ_R is an elementary embedding then θ is also an elementary embedding.

Proof. (1) By Theorem 4.3, every automorphism of $Z(F)$ extends to an automorphism of F, for a sufficiently saturated model F, and this is enough by Lemma 1 of the appendix of [CH99].

(2) Note that if $F \not\prec M$ then there is $\bar{a} \in F$ and an $\exists$-formula $\exists \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ with $F \models \neg\exists \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ but $M \models \exists \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ witnessing the failure of semistrongness. So semistrongness of a partial E-subfield is determined by $\exists$-formulas and their negations, hence the result follows from Theorem 4.3.

(3) This follows from (2) and its proof.

(4) First build a model F_1 such that $Z(F_1) = R_1\tau$, by a standard inductive construction such as given in the proof of [Kir11, Theorem 6.2]. (The hypotheses of that theorem include countability of R_1, but the countability is only used for the uniqueness part of the theorem which we do not need.) Then apply Corollary 3.2 and build another model F_2 extending $F_1 \cup R_2$ by the same process. We have $F_1 \prec F_2$ by construction, and, by (3), if θ_R is elementary then will θ be elementary.

□

Part (2) can be rephrased as $\mathbb{B}$ being near-model complete except for quantification over $\mathbb{Z}$. By [Kir11, Theorem 7.6], it is not model-complete after adding predicates for definable subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$, so this is best possible.

Using (3) and (4), and the non-model completeness of $\mathrm{Th}(\mathbb{Z}; +, \cdot)$, we can find $F, M \in \mathbf{ECF_{StrK}}$ with $F \prec M$ but $Z(F) \not\preccurlyeq Z(M)$. Hence there is a non-model-completeness of $\mathbb{B}$ arising directly from the non-model-completeness of $\mathbb{Z}$, and hence completely different from that given by the proof in [Kir11]. This second proof fits better with the only non-model-completeness proofs known for $\mathbb{C}_{\exp}$ [Mar06, Proposition 1.1], which do use the integers in an essential way.

7. Other kernels

Axiom 2′c, the complete theory of $\langle \mathbb{Z}; +, \cdot \rangle$, is not used anywhere in this paper except in the proof of Theorem 5.4 to show that $Z(F) \cong Z(M)$ where F and M are both special models of the same cardinality. The only property used there is that the theory is complete. From axioms 1, 2′a, and 2′b, we can deduce that Z is an integral domain such that $\langle Z; +, 0 \rangle$ is a model of Presburger arithmetic, but that is all that is used. So we could replace $2'$c by the complete theory of any other integral domain whose additive group is a model of Presburger arithmetic, and the same conclusions would hold. It would be very interesting to know if there is such a ring with a decidable theory, since together with recursive bounds for all the cases of CIT it would give a decidable complete theory of ELA-fields.

Axioms $2'$a and $2'$b, that the kernel is a cyclic Z-module and is transcendental over Z, are also not used much in the proof. The whole of axiom $2'$ could be replaced by the complete theory of $\langle F; +, \cdot, K\rangle$, where F is an algebraically closed field and K is any subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{a}}(F)$ which is a model of Presburger arithmetic, and which is then taken to be the kernel.

References

[BMZ07] E. Bombieri, D. Masser, and U. Zannier. Anomalous subvarieties—structure theorems and applications. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (19):Art. ID rnm057, 33, 2007.

[CH99] Zoé Chatzidakis and Ehud Hrushovski. Model theory of difference fields. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 351(8):2997–3071, 1999.

[CK90] C. C. Chang and H. J. Keisler. *Model theory*, volume 73 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, third edition, 1990.

[HS00] Tapani Hyttinen and Saharon Shelah. Strong splitting in stable homogeneous models. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 103(1-3):201–228, 2000.

[Kir09] Jonathan Kirby. The theory of the exponential differential equations of semiabelian varieties. *Selecta Mathematica NS*, 15(3):445–486, 2009.

[Kir10] Jonathan Kirby. Exponential Algebraicity in Exponential Fields. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 42(5):879–890, 2010.

[Kir11] Jonathan Kirby. Finitely presented exponential fields. Submitted, July 2011.

[Mar06] David Marker. A remark on Zilber's pseudoexponentiation. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 71(3):791–798, 2006.

[Rot00] Philipp Rothmaler. *Introduction to model theory*, volume 15 of *Algebra, Logic and Applications*. Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, Amsterdam, 2000. Prepared by Frank Reitmaier, Translated and revised from the 1995 German original by the author.

[Zil02] Boris Zilber. Exponential sums equations and the Schanuel conjecture. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 65(1):27–44, 2002.

[Zil05] Boris Zilber. Pseudo-exponentiation on algebraically closed fields of characteristic zero. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 132(1):67–95, 2005.

Jonathan Kirby (corresponding author), School of Mathematics, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, NR4 7TJ
E-mail address: `jonathan.kirby@uea.ac.uk`

Boris Zilber, Mathematical Institute, Univesity of Oxford, 24–29 St Giles', Oxford, OX1 3LB